

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-18 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9-13, and 15-16 have been amended. New claims 19-25 have been added. Claims 2, 8, and 14 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-25 remain pending.

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because Figure 4 fails to show step 408 as described in the specification (para. [0017]) and Figure 6 fails to show step 520 as described in the specification (para. [0023]). Accordingly, Applicant has amended the specification to delete paragraph [0017] and to remove the inconsistent description in paragraphs [0022] and [0023]. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment has overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to claims 1-19 because of informalities. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, applicant has amended the preambles of claims 7-12 to refer to a computer-readable storage medium, which is statutory subject matter under § 101. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, applicant has amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to overcome the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 10, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, applicant has amended claims 4, 10, and 16 to overcome the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu (U.S. 2005/0015455), further in view of Kirsch (U.S. 2004/0177120). Applicant reserves the right to swear behind Liu and Kirsch.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable in view of Liu and Kirsch. Claim 1 as amended refers to the following:

maintaining a database of *registered electronic publications* for a plurality of clients;

...

configuring a set of clients to query the database to determine if a publication received is registered, wherein *the publication is from a content publisher* and is addressed to at least one of the set of clients; and  
(Claim 1 as amended; emphasis added)

Amended claim 1, thus refers to a database of registered electronic publications, wherein a publication is from a content publisher. In contrast, neither Liu nor Kirsch, alone or in combination, teaches a database of registered electronic publications.

Liu discloses a white list (21), which is a list of confirmed *message senders* (Liu, para. [0042]). The while list (21) can include individual email addresses as well as domain names to indicate that all email addresses in a given domain have been confirmed (Liu, para. [0043]). Liu does not disclose that the white list (21) includes registered electronic *publications*.

Likewise, Kirsch also fails to disclose a database of registered electronic publications. According to Kirsch, an e-mail is filtered by the recipient's personal "whitelists" and "blacklists" (Kirsch, para. [0025]). The "whitelist" includes a list of approved *senders*. Kirsch does not disclose that the whitelist includes registered electronic *publications*.

Because neither Liu nor Kirsch, alone or in combination, teaches a database of registered electronic publications, claim 1 is patentable over Liu in view of Kirsch for at least this reason. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For similar reasons to these discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 7 and 13 are patentable over Liu in view of Kirsch. Furthermore, claims 3-6, 9-12, and 15-18 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively. Thus, claims 3-6, 9-12, and 15-18 are also patentable over Liu in view of Kirsch. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claims 19-25 have been added without introducing any new matter. Independent claims 19 and 23 set forth a database of registered publications. For similar reasons to these discussed above with respect to claim 1, neither Liu nor Kirsch, alone or in combination, teaches a database of registered publications. Claims 20-22 and 24-25

depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 19 and 23, respectively. It is respectfully submitted that claims 19-25 are patentable over the art of record.


Applicant respectfully submits that the objections and rejections have been overcome

Please charge any fee not covered by any check submitted to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 9/10/2007

By:   
Chui-kiu Teresa Wong  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,042

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040  
(408) 720-8300